

Work Related to the Recommendations of the TAP Panel COA Update October 2013

Overview of this Report

This agenda item provides an update on the work related to the recommendations of the TAP Panel.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item. No COA action is required for this item. This item is presented to COA as context for possible changes to credential program standards and requirements and the potential impact on accreditation in the future.

Background

In June 2011, the Commission approved a plan to convene the Teacher Preparation Advisory Panel (TAP). The TAP Panel was convened to provide expert advice as to what changes might be appropriate to improve the system of educator preparation and to provide recommendations to the Commission (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-12/2011-12-1H.pdf>). The charge to the panel included an extensive mandate to rethink all aspects of the content, structure and requirements for California teacher preparation and licensure.

The TAP panel's discussions, research, and collection of input resulted in five overarching categories: (1) General Recommendations, (2) Credentials, Subjects, and Authorizations, (3) Preliminary Teacher Preparation, (4) Earning A Clear Teaching Credential, (5) Additional Recommendations. The 40 initial recommendations were aligned under the respective categories. A detailed discussion of each of the recommendations and their supporting rationale is available for review in the Commission Agenda item <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-06/2013-06-4D.pdf>

The Commission agenda for September addressed the following areas from the work of TAP: 1)Induction Programs and Processes <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-09/2013-09-2H.pdf> 2)Early Completion Intern Program Option <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-09/2013-09-4C.pdf> 3)Fieldwork Expectations <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-09/2013-09-4D.pdf> and 4)Administrator Performance Assessment <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-09/2013-09-4E.pdf> . This item presents an overview of the four agenda items and the direction provided by the Commission at the September 2013 meeting. (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-09/2013-09-agenda.html>)

Update on Induction Programs

This agenda item presented a background review of the BTSA program and its expansion to the induction program, as well as an examination of the current context in which these programs are operating. In addition, this item presented policy questions for Commission discussion to help guide the future of new teacher induction requirements in California.

During its September 2013 meeting, the Commission heard from researchers and program administrators and began a discussion of the current policy framework for induction and changes that may be needed to ensure that new teacher induction is responsive to teacher and employer needs and the current conditions of schooling. Three presentations informed the Commission of the current practices and research to inform future induction practices.

- Authors of a report, *California's beginning teachers: The bumpy path to a profession*, http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/files/sri_bumpy-road.pdf released earlier this year shared the findings of a case study of eight sites with the Commission. The study examined new teacher induction as well as topics related to teacher evaluation. According to the report, a significant number of new teachers are not participating in induction during their first two years of teaching.
- The New Teacher Center (<http://newteachercenter.org/>) is a national non-profit that focuses on improving student learning by accelerating the effectiveness of new teachers and school leaders. The New Teacher Center has been working with new teacher induction since 1998. Representatives from the New Teacher Center shared best practices from their work within California and across the nation with the Commission.
- Barbara Howard, Director of the Riverside County Office of Education's Teacher Support Center, shared information on the RIMS-BTSA Induction program. <http://rimsbtsa.ucr.edu/> RIMS-BTSA is a consortium program that serves districts in Riverside, Inyo, Mono and San Bernardino counties in partnership with the University of California, Riverside and CSU San Bernardino.

The following chart, included in the full agenda item, shows the number of participating teachers who have been served through BTSA Induction since 1995 and the funding provided to the programs during the years of dedicated per participant program funding and flexible funding.

Year	BTSA Induction	
	# Participants	Total Funding in Millions
1995-1996	1,800	\$5.5
1996-1997	2,500	\$7.5
1997-1998	5,200	\$17.5
1998-1999	12,410	\$66.0
1999-2000	23,500	\$72.0
2000-2001	24,500	\$87.4
2001-2002	22,253	\$84.6

Year	BTSA Induction	
	# Participants	Total Funding in Millions
2002-2003	21,735	\$88.1
2003-2004	21,064	\$88.1
2004-2005	20,339	\$85.9
2005-2006	25,810	\$81.9
2006-2007	28,264	\$102.99
2007-2008	30,118	\$128.01
2008-2009	27,280	\$106.03
2009-2010	17,982	<i>\$90.397</i>
2010-2011	13,227	<i>\$90.397</i>
2011-2012	13,095	<i>\$90.397</i>
2012-2013	16,354	<i>\$90.397</i>

Italics: Flexible funding and may be used for any educational purpose

Beginning with the 2013-14 year, Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) is California's new school funding system. The passage of LCFF legislation (Assembly Bill 97 and Senate Bill 91) extends the prior education reforms of 2009 and moves expenditure decisions from categorically state determined allocations to a locally determined system designed to be based on equity, transparency and performance. Under LCFF, LEAs will receive funding amounts based on the demographic configuration of their student population. LEAs will be required to base funding decisions on the state priorities in *EC* §52060(d). Funds previously set aside for BTSA are included in the LCFF fiscal provisions. With LCFF, the districts and county offices with Commission-approved Induction Programs no longer receive funding based on the fact that they sponsor a Commission-approved induction program.

As highlighted in the August 2013 Commission agenda item, <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-08/2013-08-3A.pdf>, the TAP panel recommendations call for the following revisions to the Induction Program Standards.

1. The Commission should require a Transition Plan be developed at the end of the Preliminary program and be provided to the Induction Program by the candidate. This Transition Plan should be one basis for the Individual Induction Plan (IIP). The candidate, the employing district designee and the approved clear credential program representative, should develop the IIP. The IIP should incorporate a clear action plan, which incorporates the school and district goals. The candidate will leave induction with a program completion assessment learning plan to inform their next phase of professional learning.
2. The Commission should direct that the Induction standards be reviewed and revised to ensure that there: a) are clear and more rigorous expectations for mentors including teaching expertise, careful and rigorous selection, systematic assignment, and high quality ongoing development and support and b) is language about leadership, structures and resources necessary to operate an Induction program.
3. The Commission should direct that the induction program standards define Induction as two years of individualized support for participating teachers.

4. The Commission should direct that expectations be made more rigorous so that candidates are required to demonstrate comprehensive competence prior to recommendation for the clear credential.
5. The TAP panel recognizes the importance of a strong statewide infrastructure as an indispensable component to an effective teacher induction system in California. The state should renew its commitment to this successful model and take appropriate steps to ensure that it continues into the future. Further, the state should consider the benefits of expanding this highly successful concept of a regional infrastructure system used historically by teacher induction by building a more comprehensive regional system that is cohesive across, and supportive of, all educator preparation programs.

Induction Policy Considerations

This September 2013 study session was intended to review the implementation of induction; reaffirm what works, and discuss whether policies need to be adjusted to ensure that programs are responsive to candidate needs and the current conditions of schooling. The following questions were presented for discussion:

Induction Program Design and Standards:

- a) Are the induction standards and induction programs responsive to the needs of the beginning teacher? What changes in standards are necessary in order to align with current conditions in the schools?
- b) Should the Commission look at the Induction formative assessment system and standards to focus emphasis on mentor based support that leads to effective measures of candidate competency?
- c) What role does formative assessment play in effective induction programs and should requirement for formative assessment be streamlined?
- d) The TAP recommendations suggest a Transition Plan that would move with the candidate from the Preliminary Program to the Induction program, that Induction should be 2 years of individualized support, that the standards should be more rigorous and clear regarding mentor qualifications and development, and that the expectations for the completion of induction should focus more on outcomes so that new teachers demonstrate competence prior to recommendation for the clear credential. Should these recommendations be forwarded to the planned standards writing team?

Induction Program Participation and Eligibility:

The study session also focused on current legislation and policies that define key issues around employment and licensure. The first of these is eligibility for induction. Education Code §44279.1(2) states that a beginning teacher is eligible to participate in Induction and defines a beginning teacher as a teacher with a valid California preliminary teaching credential. There are individuals teaching in the public schools who do not yet hold a preliminary credential.

- e) Should the definition of eligibility for participation in induction be expanded to include non- preliminary credential holding candidates (i.e. individuals on short term permits, intern credentials or substitute permits) and should induction programs serve all

individuals in new teaching settings, regardless of credential status? If so, what is the role of the induction licensure and accreditation process under this set of expectations?

- f) Is the expectation of the Commission that induction should be available to all preliminary credentialed teachers?
- g) Can, and if so, should, the Commission formalize policy relating to the authorization of the preliminary credential so that all teachers holding a preliminary credential are required to receive induction program support in their two first years of teaching, regardless of employment conditions such as temporary, part time, full time, or probationary status?

Commission Discussion

Among the many related aspects of induction discussed by the Commission, were the following:

- Flexibility for 1 or 2 year Induction model—yes or no
- What is the accreditation practice now and what should it be for the future?
- How can high quality mentorship be encouraged?
- Should there be minimum requirements related to mentor contact with participating teachers?
- Where should/can support come from in the districts?
- Infrastructure that supports the program---ways to think creatively on this
- Access and availability within the current fiscal context.
- The relationship between employer, participating teacher, and the program.
- Eligibility for induction services or consideration of other support structures. (Substitute teaching, new teachers on temporary contracts/assignments)
- More guidance from staff prior to the next steps of revising the induction standards next year via a standards writing panel

:

Staff was directed to continue to work with stakeholders on these topics and return at a future Commission meeting with additional information for consideration.

Overview of the Early Completion Intern Program Option and Recommendation for Adoption of a Replacement for the Teaching Foundations Examination

This item was presented as a recommendation for the Commission's consideration and potential action concerning a replacement for the Teaching Foundations Examination (TFE) used as part of the statutory requirements for candidates participating in the ECO option, and a further discussion of the recommendations concerning the ECO made by the Teacher Preparation Advisory (TAP) panel. The policy question addressed: What are the most promising options to improve the ECO route for candidates and for programs?

.

Background

The Early Completion Option for multiple subject, single subject, and Level I education specialist intern program candidates was first established in law with the passage of Senate Bill 57, (Scott, Chap. 269, Stats. 2001). Successful completion of the requirements for the ECO allows a candidate to waive the program preparation coursework (typically equivalent to 15 to 20

semester units of coursework) and also the program fieldwork. ECO candidates must meet a number of statutory requirements, including

- Satisfying the entrance requirements to an intern program, as follows:
 - Bachelor's or higher degree from a regionally accredited college or university;
 - Meeting the Basic Skills requirement;
 - Subject matter competence;
 - Knowledge of the U.S. Constitution (via exam or coursework);
 - Professional fitness (fingerprinting); and
 - Any additional requirements established by the individual program (e.g., GPA, experience).
- Passing a written assessment of teaching foundations adopted for this purpose by the Commission,
- Passing the teaching performance assessment on the first attempt (multiple and single subject candidates),
- Passing the RICA (multiple subjects and education specialist candidates), and
- Meeting the professional fitness requirements as set forth in EC §§44339, 44340, and 44341.

Intern candidates who successfully meet the ECO requirements must be recommended by their approved program for the credential. The numbers of ECO candidates over the past five years are presented in the following chart.

Number of Early Completion Intern Option Candidates by Subject, 2007– 2012

Testing Year	Multiple Subjects	English	Mathematics	Science
	N Completed	N Completed	N Completed	N Completed
2007-08	132	57	54	65
2008-09	137	52	72	60
2009-10	103	32	58	65
2010-11	103	28	52	64
2011-12	138	18	32	52
Totals	613	187	268	306

Note: Additional details on ECO candidates (e.g., gender, ethnicity) can be found in the June 2013 agenda item at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-06/2013-06-4B.pdf>.

Early Completion Option for Level I Education Specialist Candidates

As indicated above, the ECO option was first established in law in 2001, and initially applied only to multiple and single subject candidates. In 2004 the ECO option was expanded within the Education Code to include Level I Mild/Moderate Education Specialist candidates. Although Level I Mild/Moderate Education Specialist candidates are statutorily eligible for the Early Completion Option, these candidates have not been able to date to take advantage of this option. During 2004, staff looked for available written assessments that could meet the requirements specified in EC§44468 for Level I Education Specialist candidates and found none; in addition, the statutory Teaching Performance Assessment requirement applied only to multiple and single subject candidates and not to Education Specialist candidates.

Recommendations from the TAP Panel Concerning the Early Completion Option

The TAP panel made the recommendations concerning the ECO, as noted in the June 2013 agenda item (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-06/2013-06-4D.pdf>). In general, these recommendations concern an interest on the part of intern preparation programs to have a degree of control over the selection of ECO candidates and on requirements for their preparation since the programs are required by statute to recommend ECO candidates for the credential who successfully complete the statutory ECO requirements yet the programs have little actual programmatic interaction with and/or observation of these candidates.

These challenges are exacerbated by the limitations of the qualifying exam, The Teaching Foundations Examination (TFE). The panel has concluded that this examination is an inadequate entry assessment for individuals to qualify for the Early Completion Option and recommends that the Commission should find a better entry assessment. It is important to note that the TFE examination does not adequately assess an individual's knowledge of teaching English Learners yet the credential the individual earns includes an authorization to teach English Learners. Although the TAP panel recommended replacing the TFE with another assessment, taking action on the panel's recommendation has been made moot by the discontinuance in July 2013 of the TFE by its owner, the Educational Testing Service (ETS).

Commission Action

The Commission took the following action related to the ECO option for teaching credentials. :

1. Use the **National Evaluation Series (NES) Assessment of Professional Knowledge: Elementary (051)** to replace the Teaching Foundations: Multiple Subjects examination.
2. Use the **National Evaluation Series (NES) Assessment of Professional Knowledge: Secondary (052)** to replace the TFE: English, Mathematics, and Science examinations.
3. Adopt the national benchmark passing score standard on both of the NES assessments of a scaled score of 220 on a scale of 100-300.
4. Adapt as needed and use the subject-specific pedagogy task of the applicable Teaching Performance Assessment model to address the evaluation of the candidate's methods of teaching the subject fields.
5. Direct staff to initiate the rulemaking process to require that interns in the ECO route complete their TPA within the first year of their internship program.
6. Provide clarifying information to the field regarding the expectation that interns in the ECO route receive mentoring and supervision required for all interns as specified within the pending regulations under 5 California Code of Regulations §80033 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-08/2013-08-1H.pdf>).

Administrative Performance Assessment

Information regarding the Administrator Performance Assessment (APA) will be presented to COA in a separate agenda item. In short, action was taken to move forward with the appropriate implementation of a two part performance assessment (content knowledge/understanding and demonstration of performance expectations) for all candidates seeking a Preliminary Administrative Credential.

Additional information will be available in the future as the Commission continues its work in this area.

Field Experience Requirements and Standards

Due to a lengthy September Commission Agenda the field experience item was moved to the December Commission Agenda. The agenda item included the following recommendations:

- That the Commission establish a minimum number of field experience hours that candidates must complete prior to being recommended for a preliminary teaching credential or direct the standards writing panel to recommend a minimum number of fieldwork hours within the revised standards. Staff suggests the Commission consider establishing a 500 hour minimum.
- That the Commission direct the standards writing panel to more explicitly identify the important aspects of what constitutes a high quality field experience, and take into account best practices and new and changing context (such as residency models). In doing so, the panel should reconsider whether some of the requirements in the current standards should remain or whether they might impede a high quality field experience (for example, the requirement for multiple settings, two grade levels, etc.).
- That the Commission direct the standards writing panel to be more explicit about the expectations related to cooperating teachers. Examples of areas in which the Commission may wish to be more explicit include:
 - Identifying knowledge and skills required for cooperating teachers related to their roles as instructional models and mentors.
 - Identifying the required components of training for cooperating teachers that adequately identify their role in mentoring and assisting in candidates' growth and development.
 - Identifying required components of effective evaluation systems that institutions must employ in evaluating effectiveness of their cooperating teachers.
 - Ensuring that cooperating teachers are fully knowledgeable about program goals, objectives, and candidate expectations including elements of the TPA.
- That the Commission direct the standards writing panel to be more explicit about the expectations related to program supervisors. Examples of areas in which the Commission may wish to be more explicit include:
 - Identifying the knowledge and skills related to current initiatives and realities of public school teachers.
 - Identifying the required components of training for supervisors that adequately reflect their role in candidates growth and development.
 - Identifying required components of effective evaluation systems that institutions must employ in evaluating the effectiveness of their program supervisors.

Additional TAP Agenda Items

There were 40 recommendations from the TAP Panel and the Commission continues to work through each of these. At this time, consideration of the TAP recommendation to add two new Single Subject credentials in Theatre and Dance has been delayed.

In addition, stakeholders are meeting in October and November to provide input regarding a possible stand-alone Early Childhood Education credential, as requested by the Commission. The information gathered will be shared at a future Commission meeting.

The Commission's discussion of the work related to the TAP panel recommendations along with input from stakeholders resulted in guidance from the Commission for staff to return in December with additional input. Based on the Commission's direction, staff will provide information requested to inform the process and move forward with the prioritized recommendations for consideration at future Commission meetings.

The TAP website (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/TAP.html>) provides background documents reviewed by the panel and other information the COA may find helpful.

Implications for the COA

COA should consider ways in which these possible changes will impact the accreditation system and any processes or procedures that might need to be put into place to ensure appropriate oversight.